ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)	FILE

FROM:	EXTENSION	NO.
Chairman, Language Development Committee 819 Glebe		DTR-**5782**
		DATE 4 December 1970

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. Director of Training			HR	This paper has the purpose of answering some questions and perhaps some anxiety on the part of Mr. Coffey as to the wisdom, need, and timing of this proposed change. I have purposely reviewed the background of our first incentive venture, how we came to go the restrictive route of "hard languages" and why we now feel that we must encourage the study of every language deemed to be in short supply. Included is our rationale for an achievement program without a maintenance incentive.
2.				
3. Assistant Deputy Director for Support				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

STAT

DIR-5782

DD/S 70-4783

04 DEC 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Additional Comments on the Foreign
Language Incentive Program

STAT   REFERENCE : Revision of [   ] CIA Language Incentive
Awards Program Memorandum of 29 Oct 1970

1. In February 1966 the Director signed the report of the Working Group
on CIA Foreign Language Program. Among its recommendations, the Group
included "the need to provide appropriate language incentives for at least two
categories of Agency employees": (1) those who in the future bring to the
Agency at the time of their appointment a useful foreign language skill and who
are expected to serve in language-essential positions, or in career fields
requiring periodic service abroad; and (2) those who undertake the study of
specified esoteric or "hard" languages in the expectation of accepting assign-
ments involving these languages. The Group proposed some form of salary
increase incentive for those in grades GS-11 and below, but was unable to
agree on a program and recommended that "the CIA Committee for Language
Development be instructed to propose a language incentive program within the
guidelines provided." With this guidance the newly constituted Language
Development Committee began its efforts to carry out the Group's injunction,
but the matter of incentives was not the most pressing problem to be resolved.
More immediate priorities included the revitalization of the Language School,
a systematic testing effort, the streamling of record keeping in order to estab-
lish a data base, and then the hammering out of a sound new Agency language
regulation.

2. With the final submission of the new regulation, published in March
1969, the LDC turned to the principal residual problem--incentives. We
accepted as valid the Group's assumption that the incentive program be based
on a need to encourage the study of "hard" languages. This assumption was
based on (1) the recognition that some of the expertise in the "hard" languages
was held by officers of the OSS era whose retirement dates were fast approach-
ing, (2) that fewer persons volunteered to study "hard" languages, and (3) that
competence in certain "hard" languages was not eagerly sought because it

helped assure assignment to unlikely or hardship places. We agreed within the LDC that the "world" languages (French, Spanish, German, Italian, and Portugese) were popular enough to sustain themselves and that the same was more or less true of those languages of other attractive posts of most European countries. Further, the restriction to "hard" languages promised to give us both a more manageable program and the financial ability to make the award sizeable enough to provide a true incentive. Thus we decided on a Language Proficiency Step Increase (LPSI) an equivalent to a step ingrade, actually a career-long increase, for the achievement of a new proficiency level in a "hard" language.

3. By the time the LDC had studied the problem and generally agreed, except for the DDI which Directorate has not cared for the incentive concept, the impact of our efforts since 1966 to produce a true language data base of tested and not claimed proficiencies produced disquieting insights. The picture--not alone in the "hard" languages but in the "world" or "soft" ones as well--was not encouraging. It was apparent that we needed to encourage Agency personnel to study practically all languages--not only "hard" ones. Even on the basis of the rather modest number of positions identified as requiring language competence, the CS for example, is actually short in all but 17 language needs out of a total 57--as pointed out in the referent memorandum. While we were cognizant that the need for "hard" languages would always be small in relationship to needs in French and Spanish and other less esoteric languages, the short-sightedness of an incentive policy which concerned itself with our small need while ignoring the major one became evident as our statistical base was expanded to show component requirements versus proficiencies by languages.

4. The LDC has given much thought to the matter of providing incentive pay for the maintenance of acquired competence. In fact, it has been hard to divorce achievement from maintenance in our consideration but we have done so deliberately and unanimously for apparent good reason. It seems eminently sensible to follow an achievement program with a maintenance phase, but on close examination there appear to be more reasons against than for it. If we are to have a maintenance phase and pay an annual sum for this, we must decide who will participate in it. If anything other than cost killed the old incentive program--it was the apparent waste of the steady payment of maintenance awards to individuals who were not using their skill--and worse, who probably never would. To add to the cost was the wide-open nature of the old program which permitted individuals to elect themselves for participation in its award.

2

These pitfalls can be avoided by permitting only those who are selected for study in the achievement program to participate in a maintenance phase and excluding all others with a language skill acquired in one way or another prior to the date of the publication of the new incentive award regulation. We could go a step further and limit maintenance awards to a given period of years--say three or five, with compulsory testing each year before the annual payment. While the exclusion of all others but those selected for the achievement pro- gram is certainly a management option--it's a questionable one and will give rise to all manner of complaints of unfairness. The other alternative--paying each individual who has a skill to maintain it--makes no more sense now than it did in the old program for the same reason that there is no assurance many of these people will ever serve in a position requiring a language skill. Add to this the mountain of paper work involved and the heavy testing load of a maintenance program--all this causes us to conclude that there is sufficient reason to go ahead with an achievement program in all languages declared by components to be in short supply but leave to the professionalism of the indi- vidual and the pressures of management the matter of maintenance. It may be of interest to note that the Department of State has an incentive program for achievement (only "hard" languages) but does not reward maintenance.

5. Management concern and control are essential to the success of the Language Development Program, and this basic fact was highlighted by the Group in its Summary of Findings:

> "As others before, notably the Inspector General in his 1960
> survey of the CIA Training Program, the Working Group found a
> widespread lack of essential discipline in the Agency's management
> of its foreign language program. This lack of discipline stems in
> large part, we believe, from two prominent defects in CIA's pres-
> ent language policies as they appear in [   ] and related instruc-   STAT
> tions: first, the obvious lack of specificity which blurs the intent of
> policies and side-steps the detailed guidelines so necessary for
> their effective administration; second, the failure to provide ade-
> quately for centralized monitoring and staff supervision of the Agency's
> conduct of its language program."

It is the unanimous view of the LDC that certain aspects of the Program must be left to management and we consider maintenance to be one of these. We need to encourage and come to expect employees to maintain their language competence, especially in the case of those officers whose competence is

3

a result either of formal training paid for by the Agency or of an overseas
assignment. This we think can be done in several ways. First, by a policy
of judiciously increasing through the years the number of positions requir-
ing a language skill and secondly by stressing the matter of language com-
petence in fitness reports and in all deliberations affecting promotions.

STAT

Chairman,
Language Development Committee

4

20 January 1971

Mr. Coffey:

Mr. [____] called re [_____]

He has talked with members of the
Language Development Committee and they
have assured them that their respective bosses
(Karamessines, Duckett and Proctor) are prepared
to go ahead with the revision without question.

He has a call in to Mr. [_____] the
DD/S representative and if he has any question
he will let us know.

Miriam

PS: Mr. [_____] is retiring next week and
plans to stop by.